PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

REC'D 21 JUL 2005

NTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUT	HORITY				
To: STEPHEN R. ALBAINY-JENEI FROST BROWN TODD LLC			PCT WIPO		
2200 PNC CENTER		WRITTEN OPINION OF THE			
201 EAST FIFTH STREET		INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY			
CINCINNATI, OH 45202		•			
		(PCT Rule 43bis.1)			
		Date of mailing (day/month/year)	9.9 JUL 2005 .		
Applicant's or agent's file reference		FOR FURTHER ACTION See paragraph 2 below			
			See paragraph 2 octow		
International application No.	International filing date	(day/month/year)	Priority date (day/month/year)		
PCT/US05/08311	11 March 2005 (11.03.2005)		11 March 2004 (11.03.2004)		
International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC					
IPC(7): G06K 09/00; A61B 6/00,5/05,			11, 594; 378/4, all		
Applicant					
UNIVERSITY OF CINCINNATI					
1. This opinion contains indications	elating to the following iten	ns:			
Box No. I Basis of the opinion					
Box No. II Priority	Priority				
Box No. III Non-esta	Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability				
Box No. IV Lack of	Lack of unity of invention				
Box No. V Reasone applicab	Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement				
Box No. VI Certain o	Certain documents cited				

2. FURTHER ACTION

Box No. VII

Box No. VIII

From the

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will be considered to be a written opinion of the In a demand for international premininary examination is made, this opinion will be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

Certain defects in the international application

Certain observations on the international application

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of 3 months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

Name and mailing address of the ISA/ US Mail Stop PCT, Attn: ISA/US Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
Facsimile No. (703) 305-3230
Form PCT/ISA/237 (cover sheet) (January 2004)

Authorized officer

Joseph Mancuso

Telephone No. 571-272-4750

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.	
PCT/US05/08311	

Box No	o. I Basis of this opinion			
	egard to the language, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it			
was fi	led, unless otherwise indicated under this item. This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language			
_	which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b)).			
2. With regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:				
a.	type of material			
	a sequence listing			
	table(s) related to the sequence listing			
ъ.	format of material			
	in written format			
	in computer readable form			
c.	time of filing/furnishing			
	contained in international application as filed.			
	filed together with the international application in computer readable form.			
	furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.			
3. 🗌	In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.			
4. Additi	onal comments:			

Form PCT/ISA/237(Box No. I) (January 2004)

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No. PCT/US05/08311

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43 bis. 1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement				
1. Statement				
Novelty (N)	Claims 1-12	YES		
• • • •	Claims NONE	NO		
Inventive step (IS)	Claims NONE	YES		
• . ,	Claims 1-12	NO		
Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims 1-12	YES		
	Claims NONE	NO		

2. Citations and explanations:

Claims 1-12 lacks an inventive step under PCT Article 33(3) as being obvious over Steiger et al. (US 6,002,959).

With regard to claim 1 Lindquist discloses an apparatus for identifying and labeling spinal structures in a medical diagnostic image of a patient, comprising: a memory configured to receive the medical diagnostic images; a program stored in the memory and operatively configured to detect a plurality of voxels in the image as candidate spinal structures, to apply at least one spinal structure constraint to identify a subset of the plurality of voxels as a series of spinal structures, and to label the series of spinal structures as a selected specified one of a cervical, thoracic, lumber vertebral structures; and a processor in communication with the memory to perform the program (see the system in Figure 15 and its respective portion in the specification. Figure 16 shows the details of the spinal structures detected from the image. Bottom of column 11 to columns 12-13 shows the process of analyzing and labeling structure of a spine). It would have been obvious to the person of an ordinary skill in the art to analyze a subset of voxels in order obtain and label the series of spinal structures.

Claim 12 lacks an inventive step under PCT Article 33(3) as being obvious over Alder et al. (US 6,023,495).

With regard to claim 12 Alder discloses a method for performing a medical diagnostic imaging scan of a patient (Figures 1-2), comprising placing a longitudinally unique opaque spinal coil on external to a spine of a patient; performing a scout scan; identifying and labeling on diagnostic scans each vertebral body of the spin; autoprescribing a portion proximate to a vertebral body for detailed scan; identifying a unique longitudinal position of the spinal coil proximate to a surgical site contained within the sutoprescribed portion; and inserting a therapeutic instrument localized by the spinal coil to the surgical site (col. 5 lines 26-62).

Form PCT/ISA/237 (Box No. V) (January 2004)